

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

|                              |   |                          |
|------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| NETLIST, INC.,               | ) |                          |
|                              | ) |                          |
| Plaintiff,                   | ) |                          |
|                              | ) | Case No. 2:22-cv-293-JRG |
| vs.                          | ) |                          |
|                              | ) | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED      |
| SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO, LTD; | ) | (Lead Case)              |
| SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, | ) |                          |
| INC.; SAMSUNG SEMICONDUCTOR  | ) |                          |
| INC.,                        | ) |                          |
|                              | ) |                          |
| Defendants.                  | ) |                          |

---

|                          |   |                          |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| NETLIST, INC.,           | ) |                          |
|                          | ) |                          |
| Plaintiff,               | ) |                          |
|                          | ) | Case No. 2:22-cv-294-JRG |
| vs.                      | ) |                          |
|                          | ) | JURY TRIAL DEMANDED      |
| MICRON TECHNOLOGY, INC.; | ) |                          |
| MICRON SEMICONDUCTOR     | ) |                          |
| PRODUCTS, INC.; MICRON   | ) |                          |
| TECHNOLOGY TEXAS LLC,    | ) |                          |
|                          | ) |                          |
| Defendants.              | ) |                          |

---

**ORDER**

The Court, having considered Plaintiff Netlist, Inc.’s Motion to Compel 30(b)(6) Deposition Testimony and Responses to Questions for Which Samsung’s Counsel Improperly Instructed Seungmo Jung Not to Answer, is of the opinion that said motion should be GRANTED.